EXHIBIT 12

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
2
              EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
3
    In Re:
                               )
5
   ZOLOFT (SERTRALINE
                              ) MDL No 2342
    HYDROCHLORIDE) PRODUCTS )
6 LIABILITY LITIGATION ) 2:12-MD-02342-CMR
7
8
9
10
                EXPERT WITNESS TESTIMONY OF
11
                  NICHOLAS P. JEWELL, Ph.D.
      CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
12
13
                 Held at the Law Offices of
14
              Skikos, Crawford, Skikos & Joseph
One Sansome Street, San Francisco, California
16
              Tuesday, May 5, 2015, 9:27 a.m.
17
18
19
2.0
21
22
   REPORTED BY: ELAINA BULDA-JONES, CSR #11720
23
24
25
```

```
1
                          APPEARANCES
 2
 3
    For the Plaintiffs:
 4
            Reilly Pozner LLP
            1900 Sixteenth Street, Suite 1700
            Denver, Colorado 80202
 5
            BY: JOSEPH ZONIES, ESQ.
            BY: SHEA SHAVER, ESQ.
 6
            BY: GREG BENTLEY, ESQ.
 7
                 (PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY)
            303.893.6100
            Jzonies@rplaw.com
 8
            Sshaver@rplaw.com
 9
            Baum, Hedlund, Aristei & Goldman
            12100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 950
10
            Los Angeles, California 90025
            BY: CYNTHIA L. GARBER, ESQ.
11
            800.827.0087
            CGarber@Baum-HedlundLaw.com
12
13
    For the Defendant Pfizer:
14
15
            Quinn Emanuel
            51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
16
            New York, New York 10010
            BY: BERT L. WOLFF, ESQ.
17
            BY: JONATHAN S. TAM, ESQ.
            212.849.7596
            Bertwolff@quinnemanuel.com
18
            Jonathantam@quinnemanuel.com
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
For the Defendant Pfizer:
 1
 2
            Kaye Scholer LLP
            250 West 55th Street
 3
            New York, New York 10019-9710
            BY: BERT L. SLONIM, ESQ.
            BY: AARON H. LEVINE, ESQ.
 4
            BY: PAMELA J. YATES, ESQ.
            212.836.8897
 5
            Bert.slonim@kayescholer.com
            Aaron.levine@kayescholer.com
 6
             (PRESENT TELEPHONICALLY)
 7
 8
     Also present:
 9
            Jonathan Flinker, videographer
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

- 1 study, which is a very specific population-based
- 2 cohort study in Quebec, relates to the comments of
- 3 Judge Rufe regarding her overall methodology in the
- 4 Zoloft litigation, which involved, presumably,
- 5 reviewing the totality of the literature. Which is
- 6 a very different animal.
- 7 I do not believe that Judge Rufe said that
- 8 she was -- there's anything in there to say that her
- 9 scientific articles would not be credible in her own
- 10 research area. So without that, I would just take
- 11 this at face value and recognizing the conflict of
- interest as much as I would the conflict of interest
- if there were papers with Pfizer authors on it.
- 14 BY MR. WOLFF:
- 15 Q. So when you say that you take this at face
- value, does that mean that you took the data
- reported in Dr. Berard's 2015 study at face value?
- 18 A. I mean I just take the paper. I take the
- 19 paper for what it is. And then now we've got a
- 20 newer version than what, I guess, I was looking at
- 21 back in February when I wrote -- when I was aware of
- 22 this.
- I didn't say I shouldn't look at this
- paper because she's being not accepted as an expert
- in the Zoloft litigation. I didn't take that as a

- 1 sign that I should ignore this paper in its
- 2 entirety.
- Q. Did you independently assess her data?
- 4 A. I looked at her -- no, I did not
- 5 independently assess her data. I looked at her data
- 6 that was in summary form on, I think, largely in
- 7 table two of the paper in -- on page -- no,
- 8 that's -- you know, I can't remember.
- 9 It was one -- I'm looking at a slightly
- 10 different version here. Is there a supplement in
- 11 here? I looked at some of the data. I -- actually
- 12 the first time I was asked to look at that data was
- by Pfizer's counsel at the Frye hearing when she
- 14 requested that I actually analyze data from an
- earlier version of this that she -- she abstracted
- and flashed up on a screen or something in the Frye
- 17 hearing. I don't remember the details.
- Q. Let's -- let's just sort of, again, in
- 19 stepwise fashion, in the abstract of the 2015 study
- 20 Dr. Berard reports that Zoloft exposure was
- 21 associated with an increased risk of atrial
- ventricular defects specifically with a risk ratio
- of 1.34, 95 percent confidence interval of 1.02 to
- 24 1.76 with nine exposed cases --
- A. Uh-huh.

- Q. -- and craniosynostosis with a risk ratio
- of 2.03, a 95 percent confidence interval of 1.09 to
- 3 3.75 with three exposed cases, correct?
- 4 A. You read that correctly.
- Q. And as part of your review of Dr. Kimmel's
- 6 transcript from the Frye hearing that was held
- before Judge Bernstein, did you read that portion
- 8 where Dr. Kimmel addressed with particularity his
- 9 questions about the accuracy and reliability of the
- data analysis in Dr. Berard's 2015 study?
- 11 A. I may or may not have in the transcript,
- 12 but I certainly -- it's more fresh in my memory,
- reading his comments in his rebuttal report that we
- 14 referred to earlier that has a similar -- I think
- similar set of comments that he reported at the
- hearing in front of the judge.
- Q. Okay. Exhibit 30, for your convenience,
- 18 Dr. Jewell, is a copy of Dr. Kimmel's report.
- 19 (Whereupon, Exhibit 29 and Exhibit 30 were
- 20 marked for identification.)
- 21 BY MR. WOLFF:
- Q. You are aware that on page 15 and 16 in
- Dr. Kimmel's recent report he addressed his concerns
- 24 and included a table based on the data that
- Dr. Berard includes in table two of her study,

- 1 correct?
- A. Yes, I've looked at this. It was in the
- 3 last couple weeks.
- 4 Q. Right.
- 5 A. Briefly.
- 6 Q. Sure. And table two of Dr. Berard's 2015
- 7 study charts the data on Zoloft, other SSRIs, and
- 8 birth defects by organ system, correct?
- 9 A. It does. That is correct. These are
- 10 large groupings of -- of malformations.
- 11 Q. Just focusing on Zoloft, the only two
- 12 findings that are statistically significant, based
- on the 95 percent confidence intervals, would be
- 14 ventricular atrial septal defects and
- 15 craniosynostosis, correct?
- 16 A. They are not -- like I said, we're over
- the page now. Yes, they are over the page on page
- 18 E6. Just focusing on sertraline, yes, ventricular
- 19 atrial septal defect, the one that you already read
- from the abstract, and the craniosynostosis also
- 21 that you read from the abstract.
- It's significant in the adjusted analysis,
- 23 not in the crude -- almost very close to significant
- in the crude.
- Q. Now, while we cannot be sure precisely how

- 1 Dr. Berard calculated her adjusted risk ratios,
- 2 because we do not have her data on the confounders
- 3 that she controlled for, table two presents enough
- 4 basic data to double-check her risk ratios and 95
- 5 percent confidence intervals with respect to the
- 6 crude data, correct?
- 7 A. No, that's incorrect.
- 8 Q. Why is that incorrect?
- 9 A. Because you need the raw data to check --
- 10 not to check the risk ratios, perhaps, though even
- 11 that is a little unsure. But you don't have enough
- information probably to get the confidence intervals
- 13 from the paper.
- Q. Well, if you take a look at page 16 of
- 15 Dr. Kimmel's report --
- 16 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- he used the two-by-two table on
- openepi.com. Now, OpenEpi is an open
- 19 source software that you use, correct?
- 20 A. I use it occasionally and I think we -- I
- 21 discussed it at a previous deposition that I use it,
- 22 yes.
- Q. Yes. And by -- if we take a look at the
- entries in white and compare them with the entries
- 25 in yellow --

- 1 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- but for the 95 percent confidence
- 3 intervals for ventricular atrial septal defects and
- 4 craniosynostosis, both the odds ratios and the
- 5 confidence intervals for all of the findings are
- 6 consistent, with the possible exception generally
- 7 down to the hundredth place, correct?
- 8 A. Second decimal place.
- 9 Q. Second decimal place.
- 10 A. Yep.
- 11 Q. And --
- 12 A. That's not quite true for the nervous
- 13 system. That's the second decimal place, yes --
- 14 second decimal place, yes. That's what I -- I think
- that's reasonable. You got a .98 going up to 1.02,
- but they're very similar in all but two cases, I
- 17 think.
- Q. And if we take a look at the entry for
- 19 ventricular atrial septal defects --
- 20 A. Yes.
- Q. -- the 95 percent confidence interval
- 22 changes from 1.01 to 1.79 to 0.69 to 2.65?
- 23 A. That is correct. In -- in Dr. Kimmel's
- 24 calculation on OpenEpi.
- Q. And properly calculated that risk ratio is

- 1 no longer statistically significant under the
- 2 OpenEpi results?
- MR. ZONIES: Object to the form.
- 4 BY MR. WOLFF:
- 5 Q. Correct?
- A. Assuming the OpenEpi results are the right
- 7 thing to do for this data. Which is actually
- 8 incorrect. But that's -- that's what Dr. Kimmel
- 9 failed to recognize.
- Q. Why -- why do you say that the OpenEpi
- 11 data are incorrect?
- 12 A. Because neither you nor Dr. Kimmel read
- the statistical section, apparently, in Dr. Berard's
- 14 report where she specifically highlights that that's
- not what she did or her statistician did.
- So, you know, I was aware of that when
- 17 been asked at Frye. I knew I couldn't calculate the
- 18 confidence intervals directly from the two-by-two
- 19 table and conform with what Dr. Berard says she did.
- Now, whether what she did is still right or wrong, I
- 21 can't tell without seeing the raw data.
- But I do know that Dr. Kimmel's
- 23 calculations here reflect that he failed to read the
- 24 statistical section because he deliberately used a
- 25 method that was different from what Dr. Berard said

- 1 was used.
- 2 Q. What --
- A. Why he did that and didn't comment on it,
- 4 I can only speculate that he's not a statistician
- 5 and doesn't take such joy in reading statistical
- 6 sections as I do.
- 7 Q. What is it specifically about the
- 8 description of the statistical analysis in the
- 9 methods section of Dr. Berard's 2015 study, that
- 10 leads you to assert that Dr. Kimmel did not
- 11 appreciate the statistical analysis that was done?
- 12 A. Well, Dr. Kimmel did two-by-two analysis,
- by your own description, and I think that probably
- 14 described -- he computed crude odds ratios using
- OpenEpi and I assume he just plugged those in to a
- 16 two-by-two table and hit the button to calculate.
- 17 MR. WOLFF: We need to take a break to
- 18 change the tape.
- THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. This marks
- the end of Video Number 3 in the deposition of
- 21 Dr. Nicholas Jewell. Going off the record. The
- 22 time is 4:44.
- 23 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)
- THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Here begins Video
- Number 4 in the deposition of Dr. Nicholas Jewell.

- 1 Coming back on the record. The time is 4:57.
- 2 BY MR. WOLFF:
- Q. Dr. Jewell, is a wide confidence interval
- 4 reflective of the imprecision of the odds ratio?
- A. As we discussed this morning, yeah, the
- 6 variability of an estimate is automatically
- 7 reflected in the width of the confidence interval.
- 8 Q. Are there hazards of drawing a causal
- 9 inference from a small data set?
- 10 A. Well, it depends on the context of that.
- 11 First of all, you're talking about one data set, so
- 12 you'd -- you'd like replication. Two, if it's
- small, the variability is usually high. And so
- 14 unless you see a very strong effect, you're not
- qoing to be able to distinguish an association
- 16 from -- very effectively from the role of chance.
- Q. Can you describe the bias known as belief
- in the law of small numbers?
- 19 A. I think you'd have to be more explicit
- than that. I sort of vaguely heard that term, but I
- 21 would need more explanation, what you mean.
- Q. I thought this would have been right up
- your alley, not a question.
- 24 A. Okay.
- Q. Okay. Question, isn't the belief in the

```
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 1
 2.
    COUNTY OF YOLO
            I, ELAINA BULDA-JONES, a Certified Shorthand
 3
 4
    Reporter of the State of California, duly authorized
 5
    to administer oaths pursuant to Section 2025 of the
 6
    California Code of Civil Procedure, do hereby
 7
    certify that
 8
                 NICHOLAS P. JEWELL, Ph.D.,
 9
    the witness in the foregoing deposition, was by me
10
    duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and
11
    nothing but the truth in the within-entitled cause;
12
    that said testimony of said witness was reported by
13
    me, a disinterested person, and was thereafter
14
    transcribed under my direction into typewriting and
15
    is a true and correct transcription of said
16
    proceedings.
17
            I further certify that I am not of counsel or
18
    attorney for either or any of the parties in the
19
    foregoing deposition and caption named, nor in any
20
    way interested in the outcome of the cause named in
21
    said deposition dated the day of
22
       _____, 2015.
23
24
25
    ELAINA BULDA-JONES, RPR, CSR 11720
```